

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/625,240	KAHN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David J. Huisman	2183	

All Participants:

(1) David J. Huisman.

(2) Jeffrey R. Joseph, Reg. No. 54,204.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 29 August 2006

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

independent claims 23, 36, and 40 and some dependent claims

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

The examiner had telephoned applicant's representative (hereafter applicant) to talk about making an examiner's amendment to overcome a couple of issues. Firstly, the use of "IA-32" in the claims is not allowed as Intel is trademarked. Amendments were proposed to overcome this issue. Furthermore, the examiner stated that each independent claim should be clarified so that the decoding of the expanded logical register identifier happens in response to the claimed determining steps being satisfied. Currently, the decoding and determining are not tied together in any way and, consequently, the decoding appears to happen at all times regardless of the outcome of the determining steps, which is not the case. Applicant had faxed the examiner the amendments to be made on August 31, 2006. However, claim 23 failed to include an amendment which tied together the determining and decoding. The other independent claims were correctly amended and so the examiner is not sure if applicant accidentally omitted amendments for claim 23, or if applicant simply does not believe claim 23 should be amended in such a fashion. Due to time constraints, the examiner was unable to contact applicant to try and determine applicant's intentions.